

I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Restriction Requirement

In the office action, the examiner stated that he believes the application contains five patentably distinct species of the claimed invention, embodiment 1 being illustrated by Figs. 1-2, embodiment 2 being illustrated by Fig. 3, embodiment 3 being illustrated by Fig. 4, embodiment 4 being illustrated by Fig. 5, and embodiment 5 being illustrated by Fig. 6. The examiner also stated that he believes none of the pending claims in this application are generic.

Applicant provisionally elects embodiment 1 and corresponding claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18-23, and 25-28. Applicant makes no representations by this election regarding the merits of the restriction requirement, the scope of the originally presented claims, or the possible existence of multiple distinct inventions. Applicant considers claims 1 and 6 generic.


Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments, as set forth by the examiner, are amenable to being examined without imposing a serious burden on the examiner. Accordingly, applicant requests that the examiner reconsider this restriction requirement after an initial search has been conducted.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance.

Date: May 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond N. Scott Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,666

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439